

**Greater Christchurch Partnership
Our Space 2018-2048 - Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update**

-Received via online submission form-

Submitter details		
First name	Tony	
Last name	Simons	
Email	[REDACTED]	
Street name and number	[REDACTED]	
Suburb	[REDACTED]	
Town/City	Christchurch	
Postcode	[REDACTED]	
I am completing this submission	On behalf of a group or organisation How many people represent: 100+	Riccarton Bush Kilmarnock Residents Role within organisation: Association Chair
Hearings		
Do you wish to speak to the hearings panel?	I wish to speak at the hearings	
Phone number	[REDACTED]	
Preferred location to be heard	Christchurch City	
Questions		
Question 1: Our Space highlights there is significant capacity for new housing through redevelopment in Christchurch City but to accommodate housing growth in Selwyn and Waimakariri it identifies additional greenfield land around Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. <i>Do you agree or disagree with this approach and why?</i>		
Agree/disagree	Somewhat agree	
Comment	It would not be in the interests of the people of Canterbury, now and in the future, to lose too much green-space in these areas. The predictions out to 2048 are on shaky ground anyway (extrapolation beyond data sets cannot be relied on) thus we suspect there will be significant capacity. Current housing development is already providing a surplus of accommodation.	
Question 2: Our Space adopts the current planning framework that encourages a range of new housing types, especially in the central city, close to suburban centres within the City and around existing towns in Selwyn and Waimakariri. <i>Do you agree or disagree with this approach and why?</i>		
Agree/disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	
Comment	This process has been underway for several years now with the natural intensification of areas. In our own area (north of Riccarton Road to Matai Street) there has been a range of intensification with townhouses, small unit complexes (for older residents etc) established. The area going north from Bealey Ave has seen a proliferation of apartments as has the area south from Riccarton Road to Blenheim Road. Unfortunately, a big problem is ridiculous planning allowing no provision for on-site parking. Parking is a shambles in areas such as these.	
Question 3: Our Space proposes to develop an action plan to increase the supply of social and affordable housing across Greater Christchurch and investigate with housing providers different models to make it easier for people to own their own home. <i>What elements should be included in this action plan?</i>		
Comment	Affordable housing requires affordable land. Investigate different models as suggested but avoid creating large medium density communities. They are most likely to turn into social ghettos.	
Question 4: Our Space adopts the current planning framework that directs new commercial development (office and retail) to existing centres to retain their viability and vitality, especially the central city, suburban centres and town centres in Selwyn and Waimakariri. <i>Do you agree or disagree with this approach and why? What further measures would support such development?</i>		
Agree/disagree	Agree	

Comment	
Question 5: The Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and the District Plans for Christchurch City and Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts have already identified sufficient capacity for new industrial businesses. <i>Do you agree or disagree this is sufficient and in the right location and why?</i>	
Agree/disagree	Agree
Comment	
Question 6: The proposals in Our Space are informed by a Capacity Assessment that considers future demands for housing and business land, based on demographic changes and projections from Statistics New Zealand, and likely changes in our economy (including through business sector trends and impacts from technological change). <i>Do you agree or disagree with our evidence base and why?</i>	
Agree/disagree	Somewhat disagree
Comment	<p>The plan relies heavily on current data and projecting from current data into the future, This extrapolates beyond data sets and is a known risky, even dangerous, approach. In saying that it is recognised that current demographic data does provide a basis for extending predictions into the future. However, we would suggest while 2030 might be reasonable, relying on predictions up to 2048 certainly is not.</p> <p>Also, economic and similar models are just models and have a history of not being particularly reliable.</p> <p>We would have thought a solid short to medium term programme out to 2030 would go a long way to future-proofing life in Canterbury.</p>
Question 7: Our Space promotes greater densities around key centres to increase accessibility to employment and services by walking, cycling and public transport. This aligns with recent transport proposals that signal more high frequency bus routes and an intention to deliver rapid transit along the northern and south-west transport corridors. <i>Do you agree or disagree with this approach and why?</i>	
Agree/disagree	Somewhat disagree
Comment	<p>The disagreement here is around the entrenched ideology of the planners regarding the theory of Key Activity centres and greater living densities around them.</p> <p>The residents our Association represents came out in large numbers to object to similar proposals for forced medium density. We fought hard to retain the residential zoning for the area through the Independent Hearings Panel processes and would argue our position has been proven right.</p> <p>This entrenched one-size-fits-all planning ideology has been subjected to substantial research and criticism (Monash University and the University of Canterbury). It has failed in places in Melbourne and Sydney and succeeded in others. It is a particularly good concept for developments on large pristine areas. However, in long established areas such as that our Association represents, there is little spare land and an acceptable level of intensification, in keeping with the vitality and attractiveness of the area, has already been taking place over years.</p> <p>Each area needs to be considered separately in keeping with the local amenity. Those younger residents who have made their home in the area would not like to see the dogmatism inherent in this statement raise the spectre of having the high intensity policy raised again.</p> <p>Regarding transport, trying to emulate the European cities or Melbourne where public transport is well integrated will be very difficult. We have relatively poor public transport networks and it will be difficult and expensive, to superimpose a comprehensive new system on an established area with little room to manoeuvre. Yes, it would be great to have various forms of public transport that will cater for the requirements of the population but at present it is good for only a low proportion of the population. Trying to wean people out of cars on to public transport will be difficult. The proposals we have read do not adequately address that challenge.</p> <p>Drive around the city and note all the parked cars on the streets. CBD fringe commuter parking (e.g. the roads through Hagley Park) on residential streets is compounded by the fact increasing housing density has not required adequate off-street parking.</p> <p>Many people indulge in activities not serviced by public transport and while it might be handy to live close to so-called Key Activity Centres try, carrying shopping or the weekly groceries on foot or on a bus. We will still be reliant on cars.</p>

Question 8: Our Space aligns with broader infrastructure planning (including wastewater, water supply, stormwater, energy, telecommunications, community facilities, schools and healthcare) to help create sustainable, cohesive and connected communities. <i>Do you agree or disagree with this approach and why? What more could be done to integrate infrastructure planning?</i>	
Agree/disagree	Agree
Comment	However, we believe the emphasis should be primarily on these issues. Ratepayers should expect this to be done as a priority. This does not appear to be the case at present where money is diverted to non-essential projects.
Question 9: What other points do you wish to make to inform the final Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update?	
Comment	<p>We recognise the need for a plan to take the city into the future.</p> <p>We note the lack of questions relating to health and safety. The parking issue has been highlighted but not adequately under health and safety concerns. Residential streets packed with parked vehicles are not healthy or safe for residents or those wishing to use the streets. For example, narrow residential streets are being reduced to single lane, inviting accidents. People should be able to walk safely, maybe with their dog. Children should be safe. People being discouraged from walking the streets.</p> <p>Decisions like allowing fast electric scooters on footpaths do nothing to enhance health and safety.</p> <p>Current policies have meant the elderly struggle to walk around and are unable to receive visitors. Shops are going out of business because customers cannot find car parks nearby. Face it, we aren't going to eliminate the car in the short to medium term if at all. Electric vehicles will come but these still need parking and pose their own problems with silent running and charging points required.</p> <p>The plan should look at how to deal with all the issues of health, safety, amenity and wellbeing in a far more pragmatic and realistic way which includes less theorising and more examination of reality in order to address the issues and realise ideals for the future.</p> <p>In conclusion, we feel we have been inundated recently with CCC proposal after proposal for consultation, most of them quite complex. As ordinary members of the public, we wonder if this avalanche of process is helpful. It seems designed to disincentivise meaningful consultation in favour of ticking boxes by the planners so they can continue to move their agendas forward.</p>
Attachments	